

that we acknowledge and respond to the issues of low self-esteem, economic dependency, fear of domestic violence, and other factors which are barriers to empowering women to negotiate safer sex practices.

The research bill also includes additional funding to continue the women's interagency HIV study, the ongoing study of HIV progression in women, and to conduct other research to determine the impact of potential risk factors for HIV transmission to women, such as infection with other STD's, the use of various contraceptive methods, and the use of vaginal products.

Other provisions include increased funding for support services, such as child care, in order to further the efforts by NIAID to increase enrollment of women in clinical trials. The bill also includes funding to increase data on women through gynecological examinations prior to enrollment in clinical trials and during the course of the trials. It is critical that the full range of questions important to understanding HIV in women are answered.

In regard to prevention, progress has also been made with the implementation of the CDC HIV community planning process. Through this program, State and local health departments work with local community-based organizations, community leaders, people living with HIV-AIDS, and groups at risk for HIV, to develop prevention programs for their own communities. However, despite the new statistics on HIV, most women still do not consider themselves to be at risk.

The prevention bill provides additional funding to family planning providers, community health centers, and other providers who already serve low-income women, to provide community-based HIV prevention programs. Many of them already provide unfunded prevention programs; this funding would allow them to expand their services and provide outreach to women who are not currently using family planning clinics or other community health services for women.

The bill also provides funding for referrals, including treatment for HIV and substance abuse, mental health services, pregnancy and childbirth, pediatric care, housing services, public assistance, job training, child care, respite care, and domestic violence.

Mr. Speaker, we have made progress in addressing the needs of women in the HIV epidemic, but we have far more to do. We are running out of time for a generation of young men—we cannot afford to wait. I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this legislation.

#### IMMIGRATION IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 20, 1996*

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2202) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to improve deterrence of illegal immigration to the United States by increasing border patrol and investigative personnel, by increasing penalties for alien smuggling and for document fraud, by reforming exclusion and

deportation law and procedures, by improving the verification system for eligibility for employment, and through other measures, to reform the legal immigration system and facilitate legal entries into the United States, and for other purposes:

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I insert the following for the RECORD.

#### GALLEGLY AMENDMENT

This amendment will undermine the well-being of Americans, while doing nothing to advance the goal of immigration control.—By allowing states to throw undocumented children out of public schools, this amendment would push children from their classrooms out onto the streets. The result is unlikely to advance the well-being of the overall community, because children growing up in the United States would be denied an education, and would often be left without supervision.

This amendment will cost—not save—money for state and local governments and public schools.—In order to implement an immigration restriction, public schools would have to document the status of every student. This means that already overburdened school personnel, who are not immigration experts, would have to confront a confusing array of immigration laws and documents. U.S. citizens who are mistaken for immigrants are likely to be harassed or prevented from enrolling in school. This amendment would allow states to create a climate of fear in the schools at a moment when the nation's attention should be turned to making our schools a safe place to get a solid education for all students.

The Supreme Court has addressed this issue, and ruled that the U.S. should not punish children who are innocent of their immigration status.—In the Plyler vs. Doe Decision, the Supreme Court found that it is in the public interest for every child living within the United States to have access to a public education. The Gallegly amendment would violate the law and lead to long, costly court challenges, simply to make a point about undocumented immigration which is being made in many other provisions of H.R. 2202.

This amendment is not doing a favor to states or local governments.—Though it is disguised as a "states rights" issue, this amendment does little to advance the cause of allowing state and local governments to make decisions affecting their own communities. If, as Rep. Gallegly argues, it advances the cause of immigration control to throw children out of school, this cause is only served if every state chooses to deny education to undocumented students, which is unlikely. Immigration control is a national matter, and, as this legislation resoundingly suggests, should be dealt with at the federal level. This amendment is neither consistent with sensible immigration control policy, nor is it consistent with the values of most Americans.

This amendment will do nothing to advance the goal of immigration control.—H.R. 2202 has a variety of enforcement provisions aimed at preventing undocumented immigration. This mean-spirited amendment is unlikely to advance that cause, because the education of children is not driving the immigration process. Instead, it would allow the states to punish innocent children on the basis of their immigration status, though the decision to migrate was not theirs.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOHN N. HOSTETTLER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 27, 1996*

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Speaker, due to a snow emergency in my district that began early March 19, 1996, I was unable to return to Washington, DC, until late evening on March 20, 1996. As a result of this unforeseen delay, I missed a number of rollcall votes during consideration of H.R. 2202, the Immigration in the National Interest Act. Had I been here for these votes, I would have voted as follows:

On roll No. 68, I would have voted "yea."

On roll No. 71, Beilenson, I would have voted "no."

On roll No. 72, McCollum, I would have voted "no."

On roll No. 73, Bryant, I would have voted "yea."

On roll No. 74, Velázquez, I would have voted "no."

On roll No. 75, Gallegly, I would have voted "yea."

On roll No. 76, Chabot, I would have voted "yea."

On roll No. 77, Gallegly, I would have voted "no."

On roll No. 78, Canady, I would have voted "yea."

On roll No. 79, Dreier, I would have voted "yea."

#### PERSONAL EXTENSION

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 27, 1996*

Mr. McKEON. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, March 22, 1996, I was in California, and therefore, was absent for consideration of H.R. 125. If I has been present for recorded vote No. 92 on passage of H.R. 125, I would have voted "aye."

H.R. 125, the Gun Crime Enforcement and Second Amendment Restoration Act, repeals the misguided prohibition on the manufacture, transfer, and possession of semiautomatic assault weapons. I have consistently opposed any ban on these types of weapons.

The notion that assault weapons are disproportionately used in committing crimes is false. The Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms estimates that there is approximately one assault weapon traced for every 4,000 violent crimes reported to the police. Clearly, these are not the weapons of choice for criminals.

Furthermore, I believe that crime deterrence lies not in gun control but in the enforcement and strengthening of our laws. For example, H.R. 125 enhances our laws by creating mandatory minimum prison sentences for violent or drug-related crimes committed with a gun and establishing Federal task forces in each U.S. attorney's district to coordinate State and local law enforcement officers in Federal prosecution efforts.

Finally, despite predictions that the assault weapon ban would significantly reduce crime in America, it has become apparent that, in